



MEETING SUMMARY #2
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND FERRY TERMINAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND COMMONS, BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA
MARCH 22, 2006 – 5:30 – 8:30 P.M.

Note: This meeting summary represents notes from the Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting, and is not a formal transcript or minutes. It is provided for the information of CAG members and other interested parties.

Welcome & Meeting Overview

John Whitlow welcomed attendees and reviewed the procedure for public comment. The general public was asked to fill out a comment card with their name and a brief description of their comment. John then planned to collect the cards at the end of the meeting prior to opening up the floor for public questions and comments.

John thanked members for their input at the last meeting and noted that the Community Advisory Group (CAG) was off to a great start. He explained that members would review existing conditions at the ferry terminal, the draft project purpose and need statement and would be asked to provide input on early concepts for the future terminal. John then asked Rob Berman to introduce new project team members. Rob Berman explained that since the last meeting, Laura Aradanas, the former project manager, had accepted a new position with WSDOT. In her absence, Rob is now filling the role of project manager. Rob then introduced Marcia Wagoner from PRR, who will assume his previous role as facilitator.

Additional project staff in attendance included Ray Deardorf, WSF Planning Director. Ray was invited to present information on the Long-Range Strategic Plan. Michelle Elling is the new WSF Environmental Coordinator and Leonard Smith has been a key team member of WSF Operations over the past 30 years. Joy Goldenberg manages public and media communications for the project. Lisa Parriott manages the Eagle Harbor Maintenance Facility Project and Russ East is the Director of Terminal Engineering. David Hewitt, Hewitt Architects, would provide a presentation on the initial concepts for the ferry terminal.

Prior Meeting Clarifications

Rob acknowledged the questions and information requests from the CAG at the last meeting.

- At the last meeting, the CAG wanted to know the boundaries of WSF's responsibility on SR 305. Rob confirmed that WSF's responsibility begins at the tollbooths. However, this project encompasses Winslow and on the design side the team would have to consider the transportation issues up to SR 305 and beyond.
- The CAG also had asked what the population threshold was for the City of Bainbridge Island in which they could take over operation of the state highway. The project team found that once the city reaches a population of



22,000 they could request to assume responsibility of SR 305 within city limits.

- Many questions came up last time regarding the environmental process. The decision has not yet been made as to whether the project will pursue an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). WSF will do whatever is right and the decision will be made after the first public meeting. Since the last meeting, WSF has initiated consultation with the tribes involved and drafted a Purpose and Need statement. Rob mentioned that in May, the team would start screening some concepts then refining the concepts and begin developing alternatives. Following agency and public review and scoping, they will draft the environmental document. In spring 2007, WSF will draft the environmental document and complete the document that summer. By fall, there will be a Record of Decision on either the EIS or EA, or Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- Rob noted that CAG members expressed an interest in Universal Design principles for accessibility in the facilities. Universal design is a growing philosophy with the intent to provide equal access for all. The discipline is in alignment with ADA standards. Russ East, Director of Terminal Engineering, added that WSF is committed to not only meet, but also exceed ADA standards.
- Joy Goldenberg next addressed the request to review public feedback related to the 1998 Master Plan. Members received highlights of past public input in their binders. WSF will consider this input as part of this process but the project is now very different. She mentioned that a few members suggested wearing a CAG I.D. badge and asked if others in the group would like to receive them.

Rob then reviewed the "givens" for the project. The givens include:

- A 2030 horizon for projected demand
- Facilities will remain on Bainbridge Island
- The same service as today is the planning assumption until at least 2030 - Two boat service using Jumbo Mark II vessels
- Aging facilities need repairs, including the overhead loading
- Security considerations related to U.S. Coast Guard Maritime Security (MARSEC) levels
- Increased use of transit and non-motorized routes to and from the terminal
- Balancing trade-offs between parking, transit, circulation and bicycles
- Involvement of the arts community. The state is working with the Arts Commission to determine details and ways of potential artist involvement. Rob will work with Janice Shaw to come up with ideas prior to the meeting with the Arts Commission next Wednesday.

Comments/Questions:

- Carol Cahill thought it would be a good idea to design a card to hand out with the project's website address.
- Rik Langendoen agreed that it would be a good way to engage the public.
- Kevin Dwyer said he would appreciate having cards and project information available at the Chamber of Commerce.



- Don Willott stated that it would be more useful for him to have significant, useful information when asking people to attend a public meeting. *Good suggestions, we'll produce I.D. badges and provide them to all members as well as ferry hats and project information.*
- Lisa Macchio said when the group came together last they were not sure what their role was, and members should take the time to let WSF know what information would be most helpful to the CAG. (Note: *We would appreciate your recommendations and can touch on this issue again at the end of the meeting.*)

WSF System Plan/Setting the Stage

Rob then reviewed the process that will lead to the development of a preferred alternative for the project (see Process Diagram). The project is now at the stage to review and provide comment on the early concepts. The process diagram helps illustrate the significant role of the system plan in defining the need for the project.

Rob asked Ray Deardorf, WSF Planning Director, to review the Long-Range Plan.

Ray stated that WSF is poised to release a Draft Long-Range Plan on April 3 for public review and comment and a meeting is scheduled to discuss the Draft Plan on April 13 from 6:30-8:00 p.m. at the Bainbridge Commons. WSF will take comments, revise the Plan, and hope to have a Final Plan by July or August of this year. The team used regional demographics for the Puget Sound and Kitsap County to forecast ferry volumes in conjunction with the PSRC model and the ferry model. Many factors were taken under consideration to project ferry demand including modes of access, ferry capacity and crossing time.

In the Kitsap service area, demographics drive ferry traffic forecasts. The population in Kitsap County is projected to grow faster than employment. As a result, residents need to find jobs in Seattle, which creates more ferry traffic. Between the three Kitsap routes, overall ridership is projected to grow 90 percent. Vehicles will increase by 50 percent.

In order to draw traffic away from Bainbridge, an alternative route is needed. Service on the other routes will also have to be improved. Even if SR 305 could accommodate three boats, it would just draw more people to the terminal. From a land-side infrastructure standpoint, it would not solve problems and only worsen congestion.

Adding service to Bremerton and Kingston is projected to help take away traffic from Bainbridge. The Draft Plan calls for adding three boat service to Kingston and three boat service to Bremerton by the middle of the next decade. After making this change, there is still a passenger capacity problem on Bainbridge Island. In response to this problem the plan is to add up to 400 more seats by enclosing the solarium on the top floor of the existing Jumbo Mark II vessels.

WSF projections and modeling rely on the creation of a Seattle to North Kitsap route in order to not exceed the 2,500 passenger capacity.



In the last legislative session, the Legislature provided clarity on passenger-only ferry service. WSF will no longer provide this service and will transition this service to a local operator. The operator would need to operate up to four boats in the service corridor at approximately the same fare.

Ray re-confirmed that the Draft Plan will be released and available for review on April 3 and he looked forward to continuing the discussion at the upcoming meeting on Bainbridge Island.

Comments/Questions:

- Rik said that the process diagram brings up the primary question as to what role the CAG plays in the project. It seems from the diagram that it is two-way process of iteration. *Correct. The presentations today are a way to solicit feedback from the CAG.*
- Lisa asked why the Legislature directed that WSF should not provide passenger-only ferry service. *This service is viewed more as transit than as an extension of the highway system and therefore should be funded locally, not at the state level.*
- Merrill Robison attended the presentation on the Draft Long-Range Plan to the Transportation Commission and questioned the assumption on the number of people using high-speed internet from home and added that the high cost of parking may also deter ferry traffic. *The plan counts on expanding the existing fleet with the ferry vessels as identified to accomplish service. The Legislature approved the purchase of four new vessels. The system plan anticipates the purchase of four in the next decade, and six in the 2030 decade. In the event that ridership doesn't materialize we would have the flexibility in curtailing the vessel purchases. The assumptions are based on our current understanding of behavior and trends.*

Discuss Draft Purpose & Need

Michelle Elling, WSF Environmental Coordinator, introduced the project's Draft Purpose & Need Statement. In an expanded environmental process, federal requirements dictate that the agency must present a Purpose and Need for public comment before proceeding with creating alternatives. The Purpose and Need has to follow a prescribed structure. It has to have a transportation focus and should match the needs outlined in the system plan. The project team will use the Purpose and Need to start the environmental process and it is then used to develop alternatives. It must be broad enough to develop alternatives, yet narrow enough to arrive at a preferred alternative. Once a preferred alternative is identified, it will drive project funding and permits. The Purpose and Need is a central document to the project. Michelle then reviewed the draft statement (see Purpose and Need).



Comments/Questions:

- Don commented that he saw a latent ban on bicycle transit since it was not addressed in the statement. The project should address increased bicycle volumes and indicate that it will not just address higher volumes, but safety as well. *Good comments. An updated version of the Purpose and Need does address non-motorized traffic. We are seeking this type of input and ask that you respond with comments by April 5th.*
- Lisa said she was frustrated that more time wasn't provided on the agenda to talk about the Purpose & Need. She saw a great benefit in providing the opportunity to listen to one another and seeing different viewpoints rather than taking the document back as homework. *Please consider this as an introduction to the topic. We can come back to it at the end of the meeting and discuss whether an additional meeting is warranted to discuss it in greater detail.*
- Dolores Palomo said that if the team had been provided the Purpose & Need in advance they would have been greater prepared to discuss it at the meeting. *We will aim to do this in the future. In this case, the Purpose and Need is being reviewed by a number of interested parties. The WSF Steering Committee and our Federal Highway Administration representative had to approve this preliminary draft before we could provide the document to the CAG. Given the iterative nature of the process this document was "hot of the press" and wasn't available in advance of the meeting.*
- Rik was concerned that as a resident of Bainbridge Island and Kitsap County, he didn't see how the Purpose and Need was integrated into their planning efforts such as Winslow Tomorrow and the Island-Wide Transportation Study. The Purpose and Need should be inclusive. *Our federal counterparts dictate the structure of the Purpose and Need. You'll see that the end of the document includes an "Other" category to include these types of objectives. We look forward to additional input to help us better write a comprehensive purpose and need.*

Review of Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal Improvement Program

Rob provided an overview of the program for the ferry terminal improvement project (see Process Diagram-Facility Need and Program). Since the 1998 Master Plan, Kitsap Transit has increased the size of their buses. To accommodate the large vehicles and associated turning radii, additional space is required for the transit deck. Also, as noted by Ray in his presentation, WSF has also now arrived back at planning for two slips, not three as in the 1998 plan, for the terminal.

In 1998, the holding area was capped at 330 vehicles or 1.5 boat loads. WSF currently views auto holding on a level of service basis for the entire system as meeting the most onerous of the following four criteria

- Level of Service (LOS) A for the median day of the year and number of vehicles on that occurrence during the peak use period. Currently, WSF characterizes the desired LOS A for vehicle passengers as allowing them the opportunity to turn their car off in the holding area and have no vehicles idling on the approach roadways.



- Projected number of vehicles during a four-hour peak period
- Meeting LOS C for 30th day of highest ridership
- Meeting LOS E on 10th day of highest ridership

There is a four minute difference between each LOS A, B, C, D, E and F. In other words each drop in level of service (B – F) represents a four-minute delay for a vehicle on the approach roadways prior to passing the tollbooths. In order to meet the needs of vehicle passengers on the median day of the year, the terminal will need 575 spaces in the holding area.

Comments/Questions:

- Bob Campbell stated that the intersection of Harborview and SR 305 was such a mess and should be treated separately. *Agreed, it is a huge factor in how we look at circulation. We need to look at how to get people to the terminal in other ways than cars.*

Existing Conditions

CAG members were invited to take a closer look at the existing conditions displays for the site. Rob introduced the existing conditions as a way for the design team to understand the site and to show what the project team learned about the area. He then reviewed key elements of the existing conditions displays (see Existing Conditions).

Comments/Questions:

- Rik said that more bicycle routes are used than shown on the display. *Great, this type of feedback is exactly what we need.*
- Lisa suggested differentiating bicycles from motorcycles.
- Lisa asked the representative date of the information shown on the displays. *February 2006.*
- Rik asked to clarify the intent of the current renovations at the terminal. *We are replacing the timber trestle, not expanding the dock.*
- Lisa asked if there were areas where information was still needed. *We have requested two other reports; a transportation analysis and a draft market analysis.*
- Don asked if the displays showed potential development of new homes and businesses. *Yes, and we'll start to get more information. It is more site specific on the environmental side. We are looking forward to working with the City on planning efforts that incorporate the land use of surrounding properties.*
- Rik added that he thought Springfield Consulting completed a study on non-motorized traffic. *We would appreciate that information.*
- Kevin Dwyer asked if anything had been done yet regarding the node on Winslow Way near the Chamber building. *It is identified at this point. No design has been determined yet at that intersection. The goal is to not widen the intersection.*
- Rik shared that the Public Works Department was embarking on a gateway project for Winslow and asked about integrating it with the project. *We are coordinating with Mary Jo Briggs from the City. WSDOT will plan to resurface SR 305.*



Presentation of Concepts

Marcia Wagoner introduced David Hewitt, Hewitt Architects, to provide a brief presentation of the preliminary concepts for the ferry terminal. At this time Marcia asked that CAG members allow David to present all concepts then he would come back and address questions. Following the presentation, CAG members would begin an in-depth discussion of the concepts. David noted that the drawings didn't represent a plan for the terminal, but rather some ways that the elements were put together. The elements are interchangeable. The team wants to hear ideas from the CAG on how to assemble the functional elements on the site. Circulation on the site is complicated.

The big question is how to address safety and the separation of elements. In all schemes, bike paths are wide enough for two-way bicycle traffic. Each of the schemes pulls the holding and transit functions away from the Eagle Harbour Condominiums in reference to the existing condition. The Kiss & Ride remains in the same zone for all schemes as it fits the requirements. This and other elements will be re-examined as we gain more input from the key interested agencies and the public.

David then compared the significant elements of the four concepts presented. (see Preliminary Concepts) The following are the key features of each concept:

Concept #1

- All traffic enters at SR 305
- Terminal improvements are contained within property owned by state or Kitsap Transit
- Square transit deck structure over holding area
- Pedestrian access at trestle
- Significant amount of bridge work and construction required

Concept #2

- Transit and pedestrian traffic enters at Cave Avenue rather than SR 305
- Transit deck structure thinner and longer to allow more light below
- Three bike lanes, with a left turn provided onto SR 305
- One grade separation for the circulation elements

Concept #3

- Elements separated physically on grade
- Holding area open except for covered bike barn
- Displaces 180 stalls in parking lot
- Inbound tunnel under SR 305 intersection
- Bridge across holding area
- Non-motorized exit in three places

Concept #4 (1998 Master Plan)

- Significant amount of overwater expansion
- Holding area open



- Transit deck adjacent to terminal drop-off
- Smaller holding area
- Harborview access difficult to manage

Comments/Questions:

- Don asked if the bike lanes were dedicated or shared use. *The lanes are two directions, 10 ft. wide.*
- Lisa asked why there was grade separation in Concept #1. *To get all modes of circulation through SR 305.*
- Rik asked if the intersection shown at Cave Avenue and Winslow Way was a controlled light. *Yes, and it would have a transit light.*
- Kevin asked what a transit lid would look like. *Colman Dock in terms of the diagram, but not character. On this site due to the topography, there is a better view corridor. The light is then able to reach the interior more easily.*
- Rik asked about the elevation of the transit deck in Concept #3. *It drops approximately 5 ft toward the bottom. It is slightly elevated so employee parking or a bike barn could be provided underneath.*
- Dolores asked for confirmation on the number of parking spaces displaced in Concept #3. *180 stalls. We have not explored private development where this parking could be picked up.*
- Don asked about the slopes of the pedestrian ramps. *The slopes are within the 6-7 percent range. We have to be precise when we go back to meet ADA and safety requirements.*
- Bill Kreger (general public) asked how the plans would all work during construction. *The contractor would have to determine how to phase construction.*
- Lisa commented she liked being able to see the views as she entered the terminal and asked why all the schemes showed a transit deck. *Concept #3 has a holding area that is open.*
- Paul Topper asked where taxis could drop-off passengers. *In the Kiss & Ride zone.*
- Dolores asked to clarify where employee parking was provided in Concept #1. *In the depressed area where the bike barn is currently located.*

Concepts Discussion

After the presentation of concepts and clarifying questions, Marcia Wagoner reviewed the results of the brainstorm discussion at the first CAG meeting. CAG members provided their vision for the terminal, which was organized into distinct categories (see CAG Vision). At this level much of the focus is on the big pieces of the puzzle such as the holding area. Other pieces like art and community character are important, but there is not as much to comment on right now. At this time, the team would like hear CAG member's initial thoughts about what works and what doesn't work about the preliminary concepts.

Overall Comments

Holding Lanes



What Works?

- Access to light.

What Doesn't Work?

- Helpful to think about holding for people in all modes. Consider the Cal-Tran example, which provides a nice experience for people on bikes.
- Question assumptions built into LOS guiding principles for the vehicle holding area.

Transit Facilities

What Works?

- Lid concept doesn't matter, as the team should focus on making the holding area for pedestrians and bicycles more pleasant.
- Space limitations require a transit lid.

What Doesn't Work?

- Transit lid would impact views and light.
- Air quality may be a problem with transit lid.
- Negative reaction to transit deck, concerned it will be something ugly.
- Don't like the idea of being on a bike and being under something so massive.
- Taxis and shuttle should be part of transit area rather than Kiss & Ride.
- Have a hard time with transit lid.
- Concerned with the transition from bike to bus.

Circulation & Access

What Works?

- Separate ingress and egress for all modes.
- Prefer transit access at Cave Avenue to decrease congestion.
- Providing three exits for ingress and egress is wonderful as in Concepts #2 and #3.



Concepts Discussion continued

What Doesn't Work?

- Consider circulation for taxis.
- Can't see the travel shed which should extend up to Town & Country Market, SR 305, Ferncliff and Erickson. Look at the desire line route to Town & Country.
- Consider ingress and egress for parking lot.
- Consider elevation of pedestrian walkway.
- Kiss & Ride doesn't look different than what is there now.
- Kiss & Ride has to have loop element to reduce congestion.

Parking

What Doesn't Work?

- Shortsighted to think of a parking lot only with no amenity on top.
- Need to think carefully of parking needs. People do use parking coming back late at night or on weekends.
- Concerned about parking intruding into downtown if parking is eliminated.
- Think about offering opportunities to WSF employees to use other modes to reduce the need for employee parking.

Terminal Building

What Doesn't Work?

- Terminal building blocks the view in Concepts #1 and #2.

Concepts

- First concept presents more congestion as opposed to separated modes in Concepts #2 and #3.
- In refining the concepts, think about providing underground parking under the plaza and connecting to the transit deck in Concept #2. It could provide a public/private partnership opportunity.
- Prefer Concepts #2 and #3.
- Consider creating a hybrid of #2 and #3.
- All concepts help with way finding.

Other

- Bainbridge Island has grown up; it will not be the Bainbridge we know now.
- Love the way the terminal is now, if you can fix the safety issues.
- Concerned team may be planning for peak periods alone- structure will not be used the rest of the day.
- Provide amenities for people waiting when the team gets into the refinement stage.
- Would like beach trail entrance.

Concepts Discussion continued



- Need an elevator to get up to terminal when a foot ferry is provided from the south side of Eagle Harbor.
- There is a finite number of dollars, anything that goes into vehicle amenities will take away from other alternatives.
- Emulate Cal-Tran with the bike barn by offering services and a large “parking” area.
- Consider the visitor experience, not just that of commuters.
- Would not like to have Bremerton experience.
- Make provisions for beach access.
- Allow for intra-harbor ferry.
- WSF should give thought to other types of transit such as Mag-Lev and bus rapid transit.
- 1998 Master Plan transit-drop off configuration is the most similar to Bremerton.

Concept #1

Transit Facilities

What Doesn't Work?

- Industrial feel to transit deck.
- Too close to boat.
- Lots of concrete, it has a Sea-Tac feel.
- Too much built environment.

Circulation & Access

What Doesn't Work?

- Circulation pattern too complicated.
- Don't like all the grade separations that are required.

Parking

What Works?

- Maintains existing parking stalls.



Concepts Discussion continued

Concept #2

Transit Facilities

What Works?

- Separate pathways

What Doesn't Work?

- Covered, industrial feel of transit deck.

Parking

What Doesn't Work?

- Loss of parking

Other

- Good opportunities for "green" areas
- Provides a better gateway into community if landscaping and view corridor are properly considered

Concept #3

Holding Lanes

What Works?

- Concept #3 is nicer since it allows those waiting to remain in the open air.

Transit Facilities

What Works?

- Offers a better view than the other concepts

What Doesn't Work?

- Consider slight shift over holding area and add parking.
- Transit is far away from boat.

Circulation & Access

What Works?

- Separation of modes.
- Favor tunnel concept.
- Make Kiss & Ride a loop out to Ferncliff.



Concepts Discussion continued

Other

- Open concept feels better; it will allow trees and things to grow.
- Provides a good entry to Bainbridge.
- Enjoy this concept the most.

Concept #4

Transit Facilities

What Works?

- Like the idea of transit drop-off directly adjacent to terminal

John Whitlow thanked David for the informative presentation and the work to date. He noted it was an excellent job at the first pass. The CAG would appreciate seeing a visualization of the transit lid to help get a better idea of what it would look like.

Discussion of CAG Role at Public Meeting #1

Marcia Wagoner addressed the upcoming public meeting on Saturday, April 15 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at Bainbridge Island High School. She encouraged CAG members to participate and noted that much of the information presented would be similar to that reviewed at the CAG meeting. Rob Berman added that the team would present the CAG's comments from this meeting.

Joy Goldenberg said that the structure of the public meeting was very hands-on, with work sessions and brainstorming opportunities. She emphasized that it would be great to have all CAG members in attendance if possible. To help publicize the meeting she would provide the CAG I.D. badge and postcards to CAG members, advertise on Kitsap Transit buses, and send text for distribution to CAG listservs.

Public Comment

- Bill Kreger noted he would like to see better sound, light and exhaust barriers between the holding area and the Eagle Harbor Condominiums. Also the cars coming off the ferries and up the highway. There could be wells on each side of the holding area or even just slats just in the chain link fences on each side of the parking/holding area.
- Kirk Robinson said that the concept of having public comment at the end of the meeting makes it disjointed to the other discussions. The order of the bullets of the Purpose and Need statement seemed to indicate an order of priority, which sends a message if non-motorized is at the end. Design elements should include features to help promote and accommodate carpools and vanpools. Concerned about employee parking. Hope WSF is doing a lot to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Concept #3 assumes eminent domain. The exit route to Cave Avenue is an eminent domain issue too. WSF will run into red flags on this matter. There is a 50-50 chance that Cave



will link to Wyatt, so this assumption may not be realistic. Vested interest in waterfront trail to incorporate it around the north side of the terminal. Where will you find parking for the inter-harbor ferry? Don't want to see people using Pritchard Park as a parking area. Consider the viability of businesses. This could be a potential problem, like at Colman Dock.

Following the public comment period, Joy Goldenberg noted that she would talk with members about holding a separate meeting on the Purpose and Need.* John Whitlow thanked participants for their attendance and concluded the meeting.

*Scheduled for April 3, 12-1:00 p.m. at Colman Dock.



Action Items

- Schedule meeting on Purpose and Need for CAG members
- Provide a visualization of transit deck
- Send Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan to CAG
- Mail ferry hat, postcards, email text and CAG I.D. badge to members
- Provide more information on parking requirements
- Obtain non-motorized study by Springfield Consulting

Committee Members

Present	Last	First
X	Bernheisel	Ann
X	Cahill	Carol
X	Campbell	Bob
X	Dwyer	Kevin
X	Elliott	Phedra
X	Langendoen	Rik
X	Macchio	Lisa
X	Palomo	Dolores
X	Robison	Merrill
X	Shaw	Janice
X	Whitlow	John
X	Willott	Don
X	Topper	Paul

Project Team

- Russ East, WSF
- Ray Deardorf, WSF
- Joy Goldenberg, WSF
- Lisa Parriott, WSF
- Michelle Elling, WSF
- Leonard Smith, WSF
- Rob Berman, KPFF
- Marcia Wagoner, PRR
- Kirsten Hauge, PRR

Public Participants

- Bill Kreger, Bainbridge Island
- Douglas Rauh, Bainbridge Island
- Kirk Robinson, Bainbridge Island
- Norm Wooldrige, Bainbridge Island

Other Agencies

- Michelle Fischer, City of Bainbridge Island